DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 693 FL 013 564

AUTHOR Spencer, Mary
TITLE Foundations for Evaluating Bilingual Programs, Packet 3. Bilingual Program Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation, Series A. Teacher Edition. Bilingual Education Teacher Training Packets.
INSTITUTION Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, Dallas.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 52p.; For related documents, see FL 013 562-563.
AVAILABLE FROM Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, TX 75204 ($1.50).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingual Teachers; *Evaluation Methods; Instructional Materials; Limited English Speaking; Program Development; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Teacher Education; Teaching Guides; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This teacher's edition of training materials on bilingual program planning, implementation, and evaluation focuses on foundations for evaluating bilingual programs. The guide is part of a series directed at bilingual educators and intended for use in institutions of higher education and inservice teacher education programs. Training objectives, a pretest and posttest, suggested training procedures, and instructional activities and materials are included. Among the topics covered are (1) planning and organizing a bilingual program evaluation, (2) the evaluation team, (3) evaluation objectives, (4) establishing evaluation questions and methodologies, (5) collecting and analyzing evaluation evidence, and (6) using evaluation results. (RW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED227693

Teacher Edition. Bilingual Education
Teacher Training Packets.

SERIES A: BILINGUAL PROGRAM PLANNING, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION

PACKET 3: FOUNDATIONS FOR EVALUATING BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

developed by:

DR. MARY SPENCER

FL013564

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDAC - Dallas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The project reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement of the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

This publication was printed with funds provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by Public Law 95-561.

Published by
Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center—Dallas
Dallas Independent School District
Dallas, Texas 75204
(214) 742-5991

COPYRIGHT © 1982

CONTENTS

	Teacher	Student
Bilingual Education Teacher Training Materials	vii	vii
OBJECTIVES	1	1
PRETEST	3	3
PRETEST ANSWERS	5	-
ACTIVITIES	7	5
PART I: PLANNING AND ORGANIZING THE EVALUATION OF A TITLE VII PROGRAM	9	7
Establishing an Evaluation Team	9	7
Identifying Evaluation Roles of Program Staff	9	7
Identifying Evaluation Roles of Parents, Community, and Students	10	8
Identifying an Evaluator	11	9
Initial Conference with an External Evaluator	13	11
Final Agreements	14	12
Determining the Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation	15	13
Specifying the Requirements of the Funding Agency	15	13
Specifying the Priorities of the LEA and Program Staff	15	13
Defining Evaluation Objectives	16	14
Ranking Evaluation Priorities	16	14
Determining the Evaluation Questions, Variables, and Methodology	17	15
Specifying Evaluation Questions	17	15
Specifying Information Sources, Instrumentation, and Methods	17	15
Specifying Evaluation Designs and Analysis Plans	20	18
Specifying the Contents of the Evaluation Report	21	19
PART II: IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION OF A TITLE VII PROGRAM	23	21
Gathering Evaluation Evidence	23	21
Preparing Evaluation Evidence for Analysis	24	22
Analysis of Evaluation Evidence	24	22
Reporting the Evaluation	25	23
PART III: USING EVALUATION RESULTS	27	25
EXHIBITS	29-41	27-39

POSTTEST 43 41

BIBLIOGRAPHY 45 43

LIST OF EXHIBITS

I. Examples of Selected Evaluation Activities. Evaluation Activities Schedule 29 27

II. Title VII Program Evaluation. Person Loading Chart. Evaluation Budget. Project Activities and Project Months 31 29

III. Corresponding Program and Evaluation Objectives 34 32

IV. Corresponding Evaluation Objective and Evaluation Questions. Selected Product Objective 36 34

V. Speaking and Understanding in ESL for LEP Students 38 36

VI. LAS Oral Language Proficiency of LEP Program and Comparison Students 40 38

VII. Format for Reporting Instructional Objectives and Outcomes 41 39

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

TEACHER TRAINING MATERIALS

The bilingual education teacher training materials developed by the Center for the Development of Bilingual Curriculum - Dallas address five broad areas of need in the field of bilingual education:

Series A:	Bilingual Program Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation
Series B:	Language Proficiency Acquisition, Assessment, and Communicative Behavior
Series C:	Teaching Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies
Series D:	Teaching Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing
Series E:	Actualizing Parental Involvement

These materials are intended for use in institutions of higher education, education service centers, and local school district in-service programs. They were developed by experts in the appropriate fields of bilingual education and teacher training.

Series A addresses the critical issue of the effective planning and implementation of programs of bilingual education as well as efficient program evaluation. Sample evaluation instruments and indications for their use are included. Series B contains state-of-the-art information on theories and research concerning bilingual education, second language acquisition, and communicative competence as well as teaching models and assessment techniques reflecting these theories and research. In Series C, the content, methods, and materials for teaching effectively in the subject matter areas of mathematics, science, and social studies are presented. Technical vocabulary is included as well as information on those

aspects rarely dealt with in the monolingual content area course. Series D presents the content area of language arts, specifically the vital knowledge and skills for teaching listening, speaking, reading, and writing in the bilingual classroom. The content of Series E, Actualizing Parental Involvement, is directed toward involving parents with the school system and developing essential skills and knowledge for the decision-making process.

Each packet of the series contains a Teacher Edition and a Student Edition. In general, the Teacher Edition includes objectives for the learning activity, prerequisites, suggested procedures, vocabulary or a glossary of bilingual terminology, a bibliography, and assessment instruments as well as all of the materials in the Student Edition. The materials for the student may be composed of assignments of readings, case studies, written reports, field work, or other pertinent content. Teaching strategies may include classroom observation, peer teaching, seminars, conferences, or micro-teaching sessions.

The language used in each of the series is closely synchronized with specific objectives and client populations. The following chart illustrates the areas of competencies, languages, and intended clientele.

COMPETENCIES, LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION AND INTENDED CLIENTELE

AREAS OF COMPETENCIES	LANGUAGE	CLIENTELE
SERIES A. Bilingual Program Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation	English	Primarily supervisors
SERIES B. Language Proficiency Acquistion, Assessment, and Communicative Behavior	Spanish/ English	Primarily teachers and supervisors
SERIES C. Teaching Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies	Spanish/ English	Primarily teachers and paraprofessionals
SERIES D. Teaching Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing	Spanish/ English	Primarily teachers and Paraprofessionals
SERIES E. Actualizing Parental Involvement	Spanish	Primarily teachers, parents, and community liaisons

In addition to the materials described, the Center has developed a Management System to be used in conjunction with the packets in the Series. Also available are four Practicums which include a take-home packet for the teacher trainee.

The design of the materials provides for differing levels of linguistic proficiency in Spanish and for diversified levels of knowledge and academic preparation through the selection of assignments and strategies. A variety of methods of testing the information and skills taught in real or simulated situations is provided along with strategies that will allow the instructor to meet individual needs and learning styles. In general, the materials are adaptable as source materials for a topic or as supplements to other materials, texts, or syllabi. They provide a model that learners can emulate in their own classroom. It is hoped that teacher trainers will find the materials motivational and helpful in preparing better teachers for the bilingual classroom.

OBJECTIVES

Upon the completion of this Packet, the student will be able to:

Part I:

1. Establish the evaluation roles of program staff, parents, community, students, and the external evaluator.

2. Identify and establish working agreements with an external evaluator.

3. Determine and establish the priorities of the evaluation objectives.

4. Specify evaluation questions, monitor and/or specify information sources and instrumentation, the evaluation design, the analysis plans, and the contents of the evaluation report.

Part II:

5. Participate effectively and efficiently in the gathering and organization of evaluation evidence.

6. Monitor the analysis and interpretation of evaluation evidence.

7. Monitor and participate in the reporting of the evaluation.

Part III:

8. Use evaluation results for program planning.

PRE-TEST

Part I:

Establishing an Evaluation Team

1. What are the major activities of an evaluation?

2. What are some of the ways in which parents, community, and students may participate in a Title VII program evaluation?

3. Name five important qualities that an evaluator should possess.

4. Name five possible sources of information about potential external evaluators.

5. What is a common pitfall in kicking off a program evaluation?

6. Describe two ways to establish initial agreements with a program evaluator.

7. What are some of the key elements to be included in the final agreements reached with the external evaluator?

Determining the Purposes and Objectives of the Evaluation

1. Name five possible purposes of program staff for conducting a program evaluation.

2. In what two categories can evaluation objectives be placed? Describe the difference between these two basic approaches to program evaluation.

Determining the Evaluation Questions, Variables, and Methodology

1. Describe the sequence of events following the establishment of the final roster of evaluation objectives which specify the elements of the evaluation design and process.

2. Name and discuss two important considerations in the selection of language proficiency measures for the evaluation.

3. What are some of the drawbacks of evaluation "burden" on staff and students?

4. Typically, what will be contained in an evaluation report?

Part II:

Gathering Evaluation Evidence

1. What are some of the common concerns that may arise during the collection of evaluation evidence?

Analysis of Evaluation Evidence

2. How can program staff facilitate the preparation of evaluation evidence for analysis?

Reporting the Evaluation

1. What are the four basic types of reporting in an evaluation?

Part III:

1. What are the four basic things usually involved in using evaluation results?

PRE-TEST ANSWERS

Part I:

Establishing an Evaluation Team

1. What are the major activities of an evaluation? (p. 9)

2. What are some of the ways in which parents, community and students may participate in a Title VII program evaluation? (p. 10)

3. Name five important qualities that an evaluator should possess. (p. 11-12)

4. Name five possible sources of information about potential external evaluators. (p. 13)

5. What is a common pitfall in kicking off a program evaluation? (p. 13)

6. Describe two ways to establish initial agreements with a program evaluator. (p. 13-14)

7. What are some of the key elements to be included in the final agreements reached with the external evaluator? (p. 14-15)

Determining the Purposes and Objectives of the Evaluation

1. Name five possible purposes of program staff for conducting a program evaluation. (p. 15)

2. In what two categories can evaluation objectives be placed? Describe the difference between these two basic approaches to program evaluation. (p. 34)

Determining the Evaluation Questions, Variables, and Methodology

1. Describe the sequence of events following the establishment of the final roster of evaluation objectives which specify the elements of the evaluation design and process. (p. 17)

2. Name and discuss two important considerations in the selection of language proficiency measures for the evaluation. (p. 18-19, 38)

3. What are some of the drawbacks of evaluation "burden" on staff and students? (p. 20)

4. Typically, what will be contained in an evaluation report? (p. 40)

Part II:

Gathering Evaluation Evidence

1. What are some of the common concerns that may arise during the collection of evaluation evidence? (p. 23)

Analysis of Evaluation Evidence

2. How can program staff facilitate the preparation of evaluation evidence for analysis? (p. 24)

Reporting the Evaluation

1. What are the four basic types of reporting in an evaluation? (p. 25)

Part III:

1. What are the four basic things usually involved in using evaluation results? (p. 27)

ACTIVITIES

Session

1. 1. Review objectives for entire Packet.
   2. Administer pretest.
   3. Present Part I, A:
      - o discuss the content of each section;
      - o review Exhibit I and II;
      - o role play the initial conference with an external evaluator;
      - o discuss problems which the participants have experienced or observed in arrangements between a Title VII program and either internal or external evaluators. Discuss ways to prevent or resolve these.

   Assignment:
   - o Obtain copies of several different program evaluations. Prepare to present each of these to the class in small groups of two to four people.
   - o Read Part I and II.

2. 1. Provide time for small groups to prepare their presentations on various program evaluations. Included in the presentation should be:
      - o specification of the program objectives;
      - o specification of the evaluation objectives;
      - o specification of the priorities among objectives;
      - o distinction between process and product evalution objectives;
      - o specification of the evaluation questions:
      - o specification of information sources, instrumentation, and methods.
   2. Present Part I, B & C.
      - o discuss the content of each section;
      - o review Exhibit IV and V
      - o discuss the problems involved in presenting technical statistical data on evalutions to the audiences that will be interested in the evaluation. What approaches to statistical information are particularly helpful to program staff. Have good examples been found in the evaluations that participants are preparing for presentation? What are some examples of bad approaches?
      - o discuss how hypothetical tables of results such as in Exhibit VI can be developed prior to the analyses.

Session

3 - 4

1. Discuss the contents of an evaluation report. What kind of information and formatting does a program staff find particularly useful. Is there a process for developing the report that can be recommended?

2. Presentations of evaluations by groups of participants. Examples of exemplary approaches should be presented. Problems should be brought to the attention of the class and ideas for how to prevent or resolve these discussed. Note should be taken of how different program evaluations address process versus product evaluation questions. What was most informative about these evaluation reports? What was the relative cost of the various evaluations? How were these differences in cost revealed in the nature and quality of the evaluation? How would the presenting group suggest revising the evaluation to make it more useful and more cost-effective?

Assignment:
- Read Part II and III

5, 6, 7

1. Present Part II and III
2. Have participants break up into working groups again. Have each group develop a questionnaire and an interviewing procedure for obtaining evaluation information from program staff on process evaluation questions such as staff training, implementation of an innovative curriculum, parent and community training.

3. Have participants pretest the questionnaire and interviewing procedure on friends and colleagues in order to work out the problems and bring it to final form. Participants not familiar with survey instrument development should refer to the Weisberg & Bowen reference, or to one of the many other texts on survey research or questionnaire development.

4. Each participant group should provide copies of the questionnaire to each other member of the class and, if possible, to other individuals as well. Each group should also use the interviews with two or three individuals. They should then summarize the results of the questionnaires and interviews in tabular, graphic, or other recommended formats and present the results to the class.

PART I: PLANNING AND ORGANIZING THE EVALUATION OF A TITLE VII PROGRAM

Establishing an Evaluation Team

Identifying Evaluation Roles of Program Staff. The evaluation of a Title VII program may be conducted by an internal evaluator, an external evaluator, or an evaluation team which combines internal and external evaluation resources. In most cases, program staff, parents, community members, district and school board representatives, and students will all play some role in the evaluation. Because the time and energies that any one of these groups has to devote to evaluation is scarce, it is essential that their evaluation responsibilities be defined very clearly and not exceed the amount of time they will actually have available. This is particularly true of program staff who have many other responsibilities.

The major activities of an evaluation include planning, collecting information, analyzing the information, interpreting this information into conclusions and recommendations, reporting the results, planning ways to use the results, as well as monitoring the evaluation process. If the evaluation is being conducted internally, the program staff and other program participants will be involved in all of these activities. If major responsibility is given to an external evaluator, the program staff will most likely be involved in planning, collecting information, and monitoring the evaluation process. In either case, the total scope of staff and evaluation activity should be fully described, with each task and responsibility explicitly assigned to individuals, and a firm schedule for the completion of each task. This process may begin in the early planning stages as a tentative sketch of the evaluation roles and time allocations of program staff and external evaluator. But by the time final decisions are being made on the objectives of the evaluation, the methodology, and the working relationship with an external evaluator, there should be a detailed mutual understanding of the responsibilities of program staff for the evaluation.

Identifying Evaluation Roles of Parents, Community, and Students. Parents, students, and community members may often play important advisory and participatory roles in program evaluation. Their input is particularly important when the objectives and potential uses of the evaluation are being deliberated. They also have unique insights into the problems or facilitating factors which influence the implementation of a Title VII program. Their perspective is invaluable when instruments are being reviewed for potential bias, or being pilot tested in order to eliminate ambiguous questions or to improve clarity. Their input should be sought on the question of test burden when the number of tests and the timing of testing is being considered.

In some cases, parent/community committees have been willing to assume an ambitious level of responsibility for some specific technical facet of the evaluation such as systematic classroom observation. Involvement in an activity such as this requires training, supervision, and a substantial time commitment. If undertaken, there should be a clear and shared understanding of the overall time, resource, and responsibility commitment entailed, and an agreement to fulfill this commitment from beginning to end.

Although there are many fewer Title VII programs at the secondary level, critical educational issues exist at this level. Moreover, students may be the best sources of information on many of these issues. For example, the way in which the Title VII program is coordinated with career education and with minimum competency testing will be important to secondary students. Over 30 states currently mandate minimum competency tests for secondary students. There is evidence that language minority students are experiencing a disproportionately severe impact from some of these programs (e.g., California State Department of Education, 1981). Issues of educational goals and program approaches can be understood by secondary students, and they and their families will frequently have creative suggestions to make on how effective programming decisions may be made and implemented. Their contributions should not be forgotten in evaluation.

Identifying an Evaluator. If the decision has been made to employ an external evaluator, steps should be taken early in the program planning process to identify one or more likely individuals or teams of external evaluators to conduct the evaluation. Ideally, this would be done during the proposal-writing stage. In this way, the objectives of the program and of the evaluation could be formed in a completely compatible way. The information needed for an effective evaluation could be designed into the ongoing program process. Moreover, the evaluation could be designed to address the priorities of the program and to fit the scope and budget of the program.

Regardless of whether the task is to identify an internal or external evaluator, it is essential that the person or team chosen meet several key criteria. Perhaps first and foremost is the need for the evaluator to understand the philosophy and goals of bilingual education. This is usually apparent from a review of the individual's experience with Title VII programs or with other language minority programs in the past. Title VII program evaluation entails the entire range of technical, management, and interpersonal professional skills that are required by any educational program evaluation. However, it also requires special knowledge in the area of language assessment and bilingual education curriculum models. The potential evaluators should be interviewed in depth to assess their possession of these attributes. Some of the specific qualities or experiences that would be necessary include:

1. Skill in organizing concepts and activities in a way that will result in a coherent and efficient evaluation plan;
2. Skill in evaluation design and research design;
3. Skill in instrument selection and development for use with adults;
4. Skill in instrument selection and development for use with students, particularly with respect to language proficiency assessment (speaking, understanding, reading, writing);

5. Skill in classroom observation techniques;
6. Skill in interviewing techniques;
7. Skill in sampling techniques, and both qualitative and quantitative data analysis;
8. Skill and experience in data management;
9. Writing and public presentation skills;
10. Project management skill and experience.

In addition to these technical skills, the program team should feel comfortable that a productive interpersonal working relationship can be established with the evaluation personnel. This would require, at a minimum, satisfaction with the evaluator's skill with human relations and personal communication, with the evaluator's ability to inspire trust and to relate to the program's community with sensitivity, while maintaining objectivity. It is not enough for an evaluator to be able to spot problems in a program. The most appropriate commitment for an evaluator is to identify both problems and facilitating factors, and to communicate these in an ongoing manner to program staff along with recommendations for realistic approaches to solving problems. Another consideration in the selection of an evaluator might be the extent to which the candidate is able and willing to provide training to others who are to be involved in the evaluation. A key consideration is whether or not the potential evaluator is able to make a firm commitment to devote the amount of time and attention necessary to satisfactorily address the evaluation questions. In order to structure this commitment, it will be necessary for the program staff to be very clear in the number of days that will be necessary to perform the evaluation, when the work will occur, the degree of support that the program staff and other program role players will provide to the evaluator, the amount of money available to compensate the evaluator, and the schedule of payment to be employed.

There are many sources of information about potential external program evaluators. Bissel (1980) has compiled a useful list of sources:

- Federal project officers;
- State education agencies, particularly offices of bilingual education, program evaluation, or research;
- colleagues who may have names of potential candidates, and people in other districts responsible for similar programs;
- Authors of evaluation reports, journal articles, or other publications which reflect knowledge of salient issues;
- People who have given presentations applicable to project needs at conferences and workshops;
- The ERIC microfiche system (which is available at most university libraries) which has pertinent evaluation reports;
- The evaluation centers, education, or psychology departments of nearby colleges or universities;
- Independent research organizations and consulting firms having expertise in bilingual education evaluation.

Initial Conference with An External Evaluator. There are countless appropriate ways to kick off a program evaluation. However, one common pitfall is a prolonged and unsure beginning, marked by unclear communication and vague agreements between the staff and the evaluation team. This can be very costly in terms of professional time. Since most Title VII evaluation budgets are modest, it is important that professional time be used as efficiently as possible. One way of doing this is to schedule an initial conference with the potential evaluator(s) to establish the conceptual scheme and basic understandings of the evaluation. The result of this meeting should be either a tentative agreement to proceed in specific ways, or an agreement that the candidate will submit a final plan which the program will review for a final decision.

In advance of the initial conference with the one or more most serious evaluator candidates, each should be provided with basic information about the Title VII program. This should include the program's objectives, evaluation ideas presented in the original

proposal, information on the staff's evaluation priorities, deadlines for various critical phases of the evaluation, the evaluation budget, and information on the extent to which the evaluation can expect assistance and resources from the program. The potential evaluators should be instructed to review these materials carefully and to be prepared to give a conceptual overview of how they will conduct the evaluation. They should be ready to ask questions about program models and instructional approaches, classroom and program configurations, numbers of students, control groups, and other matters necessary to their final evaluation formulation.

Program staff should review the candidate's resume and references prior to the meeting. This will permit the staff to use this conference to explore the candidate's understanding of the goals of bilingual education in general, the program's objectives in particular, and the candidate's past experience with skills needed in Title VII evaluations.

Another approach to establishing these initial agreements is to issue a request for proposals to a list of potential evaluators. If this approach is used, a Request For Proposal (RFP) document will have to be prepared and formally distributed. A set of objective criteria for judging the relative merits of the proposals and a review committee will have to be established. The time consuming nature of this approach may be prohibitively expensive in both financial and programmatic terms. It is frequently more productive and less expensive for the program to follow the more informal process of locating a list of candidates and conferring with them. Even with this approach, however, there should be written criteria, a clear process, and a decision-making timetable established and shared with the candidates.

Final Agreements. Once the program staff and the chosen evaluator have reached final agreements on the scope and nature of evaluation objectives and activities, budget, and schedule, these matters should be described in a written form and signed by both parties. This contract constitutes the formal arrangements for the evaluation process and product.

Determining the Purposes and Objectives of the Evaluation

Specifying the Requirements of the Funding Agency. The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) uses evaluations for the purpose of being informed about local projects. The evaluation reports help them establish priorities for site visits and to judge how successful projects are in meeting their objectives. Therefore, it is important to consult OBEMLA as a first step in deciding how to structure and rank program evaluation objectives.

Specifying the Priorities of the LEA and Program Staff. Project staff are likely to place emphasis on measuring student progress, determining whether specific objectives are being met, and obtaining ongoing feedback that will facilitate the management and possible modification of the program. As Bissel (1980) notes, other staff interests might be how to decide the most effective approaches to use with different types of students; to determine how the project activities could be improved; to identify learning patterns of students with different levels of speaking, understanding, reading, or writing proficiency in English and their first language; to look at the difference in rates of instructional progress of students in different projects; to gain and maintain school board and community support for the project.

The school board may likely be interested in many of these same matters. It may also be interested in the cost effectiveness of the program, and the feasibility of continuing the program once funding has expired. Parents and the community representatives will probably expect that the evaluation will provide them with basic information about both the implementation of the program as planned and how effective it has been in terms of student performance.

Defining Evaluation Objectives. This is the first step in establishing the evaluation design. The evaluation objectives will provide the framework for the evaluation questions that will be asked and the methodology that will provide answers to those questions

by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting information. Initially, what is needed is a listing of all potential evaluation objectives. Most of these items will reflect either process or product program objectives. Process objectives are concerned with the implementation of the Title VII program. Typically, these would include items such as staff and parent training, curriculum and material development and identification, coordination with district/parent/community representatives, and program planning and administration functions. Product objectives are typically concerned with student performance and other outcomes. Thus, most evaluation objectives will address the evaluation of the key program objectives. In addition, there should be an evaluation objective that deals with the reporting of the evaluation results.

Ranking Evaluation Priorities. Because the interests of various role players in any Title VII program have somewhat different emphases, there may be more evaluation objectives suggested than are feasible to address with the evaluation resources available. It is therefore crucial that clear priorities among these objectives be established. The priorities of the funding agency must be addressed if continued program funding is desired. The priorities of program staff should represent those objectives most necessary to the operation of the program in a productive and cost-effective manner. Perhaps the most important activity during this ranking process is to sift the essential from the interesting-but-not-essential, and from the trivial. Once these priorities have been established, they will provide the decision-making framework for many subsequent evaluation decisions. For example, a questionnaire or interview guide for staff or other program role players should address only topics crucial to the evaluation objectives. Additional irrelevant questions should be deleted. In other words, establishing the evaluation objectives and the priorities among them establishes the allocation of evaluation resources.

Determining the Evaluation Questions, Variables, and Methodology

Specifying Evaluation Questions. After the final roster of evaluation objectives has been established and ranked, each objective should be further detailed into its component evaluation questions. Each question should be separate and non-overlapping with each other. When combined, these questions should cover all relevant and priority aspects of each evaluation objective. An examination of the sample evaluation questions specified for the sample product and process evaluation objectives (Exhibit IV, P.36) shows how each question carefully queries the relationship among certain key variables. For example, the first evaluation question which concerns English oral language development sets out English oral language proficiency as the dependent variable. It establishes pre-program performance as the occasion of interest, and defines the population of interest as LEP students at each grade in the K-6 grade range, in both the program and comparison groups. These specifications set the stage for the next logical development in the evaluation: the specification of measurable or identifiable variables or indicators which will answer each question, specification of the sources of this information, and identification of the instruments and methods to be used to obtain this information.

Specifying Information Sources, Instrumentation, and Methods. Exhibit V, p. 38 uses the first evaluation objective of Exhibit III, p. 34 and the corresponding evaluation questions (shown in Exhibit IV, p. 36) as the basis for showing how a plan may be developed to obtain the answer o each evaluation question. For each evaluation question, the exact nature of the data needed to answer the question is defined. Secondly, a decision is made upon the best and most cost-feasible source of this data. Decisions regarding the data source raise questions about the scope of data collection, and about sampling issues. For example, if the budget of the evaluation permits, it would be wise to obtain information not only from the program classroom on different occasions, but also from one or more comparison groups which differ in specific and documentable ways from the program

classrooms. If the budget permits, student data would probably be gathered on each child in each classroom to be included in the evaluation. However, if the number of students is large and/or the evaluation budget is small, savings could be achieved by obtaining a random sample of students. If a sample is decided upon, the exact nature of the sampling rationale and procedures should be specified to ensure that the sample is an adequate representation of the entire population.

The final column of Exhibit V, p. 38 deals with the instrument or method of obtaining the information needed to answer the evaluation questions. The example presented requires decisions regarding the assessment of oral language proficiency - a difficult consideration. Although there are many instruments purporting to measure the English oral language proficiency of students, few have evidence of validity and reliability. It is very important that project staff as well as the external evaluator become knowledgeable about the relative psychometric merits of the instruments being considered. If the program and evaluation objectives address the development and assessment of first language proficiency, even greater caution is required in the selection of measures, as measures of non-English languages have an even less adequate research history and those which provide measures of both English and another language can seldom be considered comparable (Merino and Spencer, 1981). Similar problems arise when the measurement of reading and writing is at issue. Selected readings on this subject are cited in the bibliography, and it is covered in depth in Packet 2 of this series. Program staff will also want to consider the potential for making multiple uses of the instruments chosen for the evaluation. If an instrument may appropriately be used for a combination of functions (e.g., student classification, placement, diagnosis, and evaluation), money may be saved in the purchase, administration, and analysis of test results. In addition, the student will be relieved of some test burden. However, many tests are <u>not</u> appropriate for some of these functions, and if used in these ways may be damaging to both the students and the program.

In order to obtain answers to questions regarding classroom practices, it is usually necessary to both observe a sample of classroom time and to ask questions of teachers. A large number of classroom observation instruments are available for this purpose (e.g. Simon and Boyer, 1965). In recent years, some have been developed which are appropriate to the observation of language development techniques and context variables (e.g., Marliave, Fisher, Filby, and Dishaw, 1980; Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1978). All such instruments require training that prepares observers to make reliable observations, scoring, and interpretive judgments. The time-consuming nature of these measures usually makes them most appropriate for large Title VII programs, particularly those attempting to test innovative techniques and those with substantial research and evaluation budgets.

In order to obtain answers to most process questions, it will be necessary to either interview program staff or to have them complete self-administered questionnaires. The program evaluator should have experience in constructing questionnaires and interview guides for this purpose. The questions asked of staff and other program participants should directly reflect the evaluation questions and not stray from these concerns into other matters. Each such irrelevant question creates unnecessary administration, analysis and staff costs. The structure and wording of these instruments should be carefully checked by the program staff supervising the evaluation to ensure that it will provide clear and unambiguous answers to the evaluation questions, and that the evaluator has given full consideration to how the questionnaire and interview responses will be coded and used in a specific analytic approach. It is very useful at this point to see a mock-up of the tables and graphs that will result from the information yielded by the instruments. These often will make it clear just how well the information being collected will answer each evaluation question.

Once specifications such as those in Exhibit V, p. 38 are available for each evaluation question, the program staff should consider the

evaluation burden that this plan implies for the various role players in the program. Are the students being tested so extensively that their learning time is being eroded? Are teachers and program staff expected to spend so much of their time on evaluation interviews, questionnaires, miscellaneous paperwork, and activities that their program activities are hindered? When the answers to these questions are yes, then the evaluation burden on these role players must be trimmed back or scheduled in more convenient ways. The potential for these burdens and the resulting frictions or program disadvantages often do not become apparent until it is too late unless some process such as the definitional one displayed in Exhibit V, p. 38 is used to clarify the situation.

Specifying Evaluation Designs and Analysis Plans. Most evaluations will include both quantitative and qualitative information. The evaluation design and analysis plan will treat these two types of data differently. The example used in Exhibit V, p. 38 is concerned with data which is quantifiable and which can be analyzed statistically to determine the answers to the research questions. The evaluator should be able to clearly describe to program staff what these technical procedures are and how they will produce answers to the evaluation questions. One of the best ways to do this is to provide hypothetical samples of how the major tables and graphs will look once these answers are in. Along with each of these, the evaluator will be able to note which statistical analyses will be performed, if any. The use of descriptive statistics such as percentages, percentiles, means, and standard deviations, as well as graphic displays are frequently very useful to program staff who must understand the results of the evaluation in order to use them to improve the program. Exhibit VI in page 40 provides examples of how a display of hypothetical results can set forth analytic procedures to be used and provide program staff with a preview of what they can expect from the evaluation report.

Analyzing information on process objectives usually requires a qualitative approach. Although the questions and interviews may

yield some numerical ratings, most of the information obtained will be of a judgmental nature or will identify critical incidents or conditions. The evaluator must examine this information and organize it in a way that identifies and summarizes dominant themes and explains their significance and program implications. Exhibit VII, p. 41 displays a format that is useful for the organizing of process information in this way.

Specifying the Contents of the Evaluation Report. Once the structure of the evaluation has been established in the preceding tasks, the structure and content of the evaluation report have basically been established. Typically, the evaluation report will describe the project, provide information on the evaluation methodology, report the results of the evaluation of both product and process evaluation objectives, draw conclusions and make recommendations. The table of contents will therefore resemble that shown in the following chart.

TITLE VII PROGRAM EVALUATION

Table of Contents

I. Project Description
II. Evaluation of Instructional Objectives
- o Methodology
- o Outcomes

III. Evaluation of Implementation Objectives
- o Methodology
- o Outcomes

IV. Conclusions
V. Recommendations

The text in each outcome section should systematically answer each evaluation question. For the quantitative evaluation questions, these answers should include both narrative and tabular or graphic explanations. This narrative should be a clear and simple explanation of the results shown in the tables and graphs planned in advance to answer the evaluation questions. The answers to qualitative process questions may well follow the format of Exhibit VII, p. 41 providing information on intended and actual performance, as well as important issues which either inhibit or facilitate the accomplishment of each process objective.

At the point that the evaluation has reached tentative conclusions and recommendations, it is time for the program staff responsible for coordinating the evaluation to have a preview of the report. Their input should be sought on both conclusions to be drawn, and on recommendations to be made. By viewing the results once they are organized for reporting purposes, program staff are frequently able to make a further analysis of important factors which influenced the program during the year, and to suggest ways to proceed in the future.

PART II: IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION OF A TITLE VII PROGRAM

Gathering Evaluation Evidence

The process of gathering evaluation data usually consists of the following five steps:

1. Orienting program staff to the data collection procedures and schedule that will be used, and modifying these where appropriate;
2. Training participating staff in the administration of student measures;
3. Scheduling and conducting interviews;
4. Scheduling and administering student performance measures;
5. Coordinating and monitoring interviewing, observing, and testing.

The program evaluator will implement these steps. Program staff responsible for supervising the evaluation should be available to help solve scheduling and coordinating problems, and to monitor the quality of training, testing, and interviewing activities. Problems that arise during this phase frequently revolve around timing. External evaluators are often unfamiliar with school holidays, minimum days, certain overload periods such as those around report card time, and daily class schedules. The evaluator must depend upon the program staff to provide advance guidance on these scheduling matters in order that data may be obtained in a way that protects its reliability and validity, while simultaneously ensuring that all data is collected at the proper point in time. In a similar way, evaluators will need guidance on the line of authority in the project in order to know exactly whom to relate to on each major concern.

Another matter of concern during this time is the organization and security of data collection materials. The logistics of transporting and storing student testing materials may require the assistance and consideration of program staff. The same is true of the evaluator's need for private quiet space for individual testing and interviewing.

The evaluator or other members of the evaluation team may not speak all of the languages represented by the Title VII program fluently. If this is the case, it will be necessary for program staff who do speak these languages to accompany the evaluator during presentations and interviews where the use of these languages would be either beneficial or necessary.

Preparing Evaluation Evidence for Analysis

Program staff can frequently contribute to this activity in ways that reduce the time (and therefore the cost) of the evaluation. A system should be devised for recording student demographic, testing, and program information in a centralized manner. If this information is conscientiously recorded into a suitable format when first obtained and transmitted to the program office, vast amounts of duplicated recording work can be avoided. Exhibit II, p. 31 displays an example of how one Title VII program office did this. This excellent example of record keeping was given directly to a key punch operator who then created the computer cards used in the analysis of student data. Thus, by careful advance planning and coordination by the program staff and evaluator, it was possible to skip the whole step of recording student data on keypunch forms. This process would have been equally useful if the evaluator had decided to analyze the data manually.

Analysis of Evaluation Evidence

Decisions regarding the specific analytic approaches to be used to obtain answers to the evaluation questions should be made in the planning phase of the evaluation. They should not be left to be made in the later phases of the evaluation. Otherwise, the data collected may not be amenable to appropriate means of analysis. Thus, it should be decided early not only which analyses will be made, but whether a computer or manual analysis will be applied

to quantitative data. The costs and scheduling of analysis should be clearly and realistically projected. It is unlikely that analysis can be accomplished quickly. At least a month should be allowed for this function in most Title VII evaluations. Analysis includes not only the completion of descriptive and inferential statistical analyses, but interpretation of results as well. The development of written interpretations constitutes the core of the final evaluation report.

If possible, preliminary analysis of key evaluation questions should be scheduled to provide formative evaluation results. That is, information on the implementation of certain key program activities may be obtained and analyzed early in the program year in order to provide the program with feedback in an ongoing manner. This will allow the development of "on-course" corrections that may possibly bring the program closer to achieving its goals.

Reporting the Evaluation

Basically four types of reporting are desirable in an evaluation: 1) periodic reports containing preplanned formative evaluation information of either a process or product nature; 2) a preliminary version of the final report for review and input by the program staff; 3) a final version of the final report, accompanied by a nontechnical "executive" summary; and 4) an oral presentation of evaluation findings and implications to program staff, district/parent/community representatives. This latter type of report is often neglected, but it has the potential of setting the stage for the most productive use of evaluation results. It may be appropriate to use it as the springboard for modifying or extending the program objectives, or for planning new program proposals. It will be most useful if information on the evaluation is available to interested parties in advance of the meeting, and if a participatory format is used.

PART III: USING EVALUATION RESULTS

Four basic things are usually involved in the utilization of evaluation results:

1. Identifying corrective actions to address evaluation findings and recommendations;
2. Making revisions in the program in response to evaluation findings and recommendations;
3. Evaluating the effects of revisions and modifying them where indicated;
4. Disseminating evaluation results to individuals and groups concerned with the program, as well as to educators and interested audiences in general.

Too often, program evaluations are considered bothersome necessities which are performed in a perfunctory manner. But to the contrary, if planned carefully so that they conform to a feasible scope of work for both the program and the evaluator, they may become a valuable resource to the entire programming process. If this is to be the case, the questions asked by the evaluation should be of importance and interest to the program. This should not be difficult considering the current state of knowledge about educating language minority students. Even more importantly, the results of program evaluations should be used. What if it is found that the training of staff did not provide them with adequate skills to implement the instructional techniques? What if secondary students report that the bilingual program is irrelevant to their career needs? What if two of the five program classrooms produced amazing performance gains while the others had mediocre results? What if the results were inconclusive or confusing? The program should not ignore any such findings. Each should be considered carefully by all program role players and used as a building block for the next educational occasion.

EXHIBIT I

EXAMPLES OF SELECTED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES SCHEDULE

EVALUATION ACTIVITY	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DATE OF Initiation	DATE OF Completion	COMMENTS
0.0 Development of Evaluation Related Components of Application				
0.1 Assist in conducting needs assessment.				
0.2 Work with project staff, parents, school district administration, school board and students in developing general evaluation approach.				
0.3 Write evaluation section of application in conjunction with a team of project staff and participants.				
2.0 Evaluation Planning				
2.1 Determine specific information necessary to address evaluation audiences, purposes and questions.				
2.2 Identify specific evaluation participants and evaluation monitoring team.				
2.3 Determine needs of project staff, parents and community, or arrange for its provision.				
.				
.				
.				
.				

EXHIBIT I

EXAMPLES OF SELECTED EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

EVALUATION ACTIVITIES SCHEDULE

EVALUATION ACTIVITY	PERSON RESPONSIBLE	DATE OF Initiation	DATE OF Completion	COMMENTS
3.0 Designing the Evaluation				
3.1 Identify procedures for assessing attainment for each specific objective.				
3.2 Develop surveys, questionnaires and other instruments.				
3.3 Determine data analysis methods.				
.				
.				
.				
.				
4.0 Measurement of Project Implementation.				
.				
. (Steps for each evaluation component should be designated.)				
.				
.				
7.0 Utilization of Evaluation Findings				
7.1 Identify corrective actions necessary to address evaluation findings.				
7.2 Revise project plans to include corrective actions.				
7.3 Review progress in implementing corrective actions.				

EXHIBIT II

Project Activities

Project Months

	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAR	JUN	JUL	AUG
1. Conduct preliminary evaluation planning.												
2. Finalize purposes and objectives of the evaluation												
3. Determine evaluation questions, variables and methodology.												
4. Assemble and organize data and information needed to evaluate each program objectives.												
5. Analyze student language proficiency and achievement data.												
6. Analyze and interpret evaluation data on staff development activities.												
7. Prepare dratt of final report.												
8. Confer with program staff about final report.												
9. Prepare final version of final report and executive summary.												

EXHIBIT II (CONTINUED)

TITLE VII PROGRAM EVALUATION Person Loading Chart	EVALUATION DIRECTOR	EVALUATION ASSOCIATE	RESEARCH ASSISTANT	CLERICAL SUPPORT	
1. Conduct preliminary evaluation planning.	2	2			
2. Finalize purposes and objectives of the evaluation.	1	1			
3. Determine evaluation questions, variables and methodology.					
4. Assemble and organize data and information needed to evaluate each program objective.	2	5	5		
5. Analyze student language proficiency and achievement data.	2	8	2		
6. Analyze and interpret evaluation data on staff development activities.		8			
7. Prepare draft on final report.	3	5		3	
8. Confer with program staff about final report.	2	2			
9. Prepare final version of final report and executive summary.	3	5		3	
	12	37	7	6	

EXHIBIT II (CONTINUED)

EVALUATION BUDGET

I. PERSONNEL

	Person Days	Daily Rate	Amount
Evaluation Director	12	$100.00	$1,200.00
Evaluation Associate	37	75.00	2,775.00
Clerical Support	6	50.00	300.00
			$4,275.00
II. FRINGE BENEFITS			641.00
III. OTHER DIRECT COSTS			
Research Associate (7 days @ $60.00 each)			420.00
Keypunching			300.00
Computer Analysis			500.00
IV. INDIRECT COSTS (@ .40 of I-III)			$2,454.00
		TOTAL COSTS	$8,590.00

EXHIBIT III

CORRESPONDING PROGRAM AND EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

SELECTED PRODUCT OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES
SPEAKING AND UNDERSTANDING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE FOR LEP STUDENTS. To provide individualized oral English language instruction to LEP students in grades K-6, which leads to significant improvement in their English oral language proficiency skills.	To document and describe the extent to which LEP students in grades K-6 who receive individualized oral English language instruction improve their English oral proficiency skills each program year relative to a comparison group that does not receive instruction.
READING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE FOR THE LEP STUDENT. To provide individualized instruction in the English reading continuum to LEP students meeting readiness criteria, which leads to significant improvement in their English Reading skills.	To document and describe the extent to which LEP students who receive individualized instruction in the English reading continuum improve their English reading skills each program year relative to comparison groups receiving different forms of instruction or who vary in language background characteristics.
SPEAKING AND UNDERSTANDING IN SPANISH AS A FIRST LANGUAGE FOR LEP STUDENTS. To provide individualized oral Spanish language instruction to LEP students in grades K-6 whose first language is Spanish, which leads to significant improvement in their Spanish oral language proficiency skills.	To document and describe the extent to which LEP students in grades K-6 who receive individualized oral Spanish language instruction improve their Spanish oral proficiency skills each program year relative to a comparison group that does not receive instruction.

EXHIBIT III (CONTINUED)

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES
READING IN SPANISH AS A FIRST LANGUAGE FOR THE LEP STUDENT. To provide individualized instruction in the Spanish reading continuum to LEP students meeting readiness criteria and whose first language is Spanish, which leads to significant improvement in their Spanish Reading skills.	To document and describe the extent to which LEP students who receive individualized instruction in the Spanish reading continuum improve their Spanish reading skills each program year relative to comparison groups receiving no instruction or different forms of instruction.

SELECTED PROCESS OBJECTIVES

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION OBJECTIVES
STAFF DEVELOPMENT. To provide preservice and in-service staff training which will increase staff competencies and knowledge of bilingual educational methodologies, program management, testing, and language training.	To document and describe the nature and extent of preservice and in-service staff training.
PARENT/COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT AND EDUCATION. To hold regular meetings and in-service sessions throughout the school year which stimulate parent/community participation in the program and increase their understanding of bilingual education approaches.	To document and describe the nature and extent of parent/community involvement and education opportunities.

EXHIBIT IV

CORRESPONDING EVALUATION OBJECTIVE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

SELECTED PRODUCT OBJECTIVE

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS
SPEAKING AND UNDERSTANDING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE FOR LEP STUDENTS. To document and describe the extent to which LEP students in grades K-6 who receive individualized oral English language instruction improve their English oral proficiency skills each program year relative to a comparison group that does not receive instruction.	1. What is the nature and extent of the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program and comparison groups, at each K-6 grade level, prior to the provision of program instruction? 2. What is the nature and extent of the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program and comparison groups, at each K-6 grade level, at the end of each year of program instruction? 3. How does the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program compare at the end of each program year with that of comparison students, and of English background peers? 4. What is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided in each program classroom? 5. How consistent is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided across program classrooms? 6. How consistent is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided with the description of the intended instructional model?

EXHIBIT IV (CONTINUED)

SELECTED PROCESS OBJECTIVE

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS
STAFF DEVELOPMENT. To provide preservice and in-service staff training which will increase staff competencies and knowledge of bilingual educational methodologies, program management, testing, and language training.	1. What were the topics and detailed content of pre- and in-service training provided to program staff? 2. How were these topics decided upon? 3. When were these sessions held? 4. Who taught these sessions? 5. What supplemental materials were provided at these sessions? 6. Who attended these sessions? 7. How did participants evaluate each of the sessions in terms of content, technique, and utility? 8. What recommendations did participants make for improving or making useful extensions of staff development sessions for future program years? 9. How did program management evaluate each of the sessions in terms of content, technique, and utility? 10. What recommendations did program management make for improving or making useful extensions of staff development sessions in terms of content, technique, and utility?

EXHIBIT V

EVALUATION OBJECTIVE & QUESTION	DATA NEEDED	DATA SOURCE	DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT OR METHOD
SPEAKING AND UNDERSTANDING IN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE FOR LEP STUDENTS			
1. What is the nature and extent of the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program and comparison groups, at each K-6 grade level, prior to the provision of program instruction?			
(1) What is the nature and extent of the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program and comparison groups, at each K-6 grade level, prior to the provision of program instruction?	Measure of English oral language proficiency prior to program instruction.	LEP students at each K-6 grade in the program, and from the comparison group of LEP K-6 students which does not receive program instruction, but instead receives one of two different English language instructional approaches.	Language Assessment Scale (LAS) I and II; Rating of bilingual certified teacher who is fluent in both languages and who has been trained in the procedure to rate English oral language proficiency.

EXHIBIT V (CONTINUED)

(2) What is the nature and extent of the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program and comparison groups, at each K-6 grade level, at the end of each year of program instruction?	Measure of English oral language proficiency following program instruction each program year.	Same as above.	Same as above.
(3) How does the English oral language proficiency of LEP students in the program compare at the end of each program year with that of comparison students, and of English background peers?	Same as above for questions (1) and (2).	Same as above for questions (1) and (2), and also from a group of English background peers.	Same as above for (1) and (2).
(4) What is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided in each program classroom?	Documentation of individualized instruction behaviors and conditions, time spent in English language instruction, and frequency of critical instructional variables.	Adults and conditions in program classroom.	The School Survey and the Bilingual Reading Time Observation Schedule.
(5) How consistent is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided across program classrooms?	Same as above.	Same as above.	Same as above.
(6) How consistent is the nature and extent of the English language instruction provided with the description of the intended instructional model?	Same as above	Same as above, plus adults and conditions in comparison group classrooms.	Same as above.

EXHIBIT VI

HYPOTHETICAL

LAS Oral Language Proficiency
of LEP Program and Comparison Students

(to be presented for all Grades, and also for each grade separately)

Student group	Pre-Test Score		Post-Test Score	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Program				
Comparison				
English-Speaking Peers				

ESSENTIAL

Tests of statistical significance (adjusting for change score concerns) would be run on this data, first for all grades combined; if a significant difference is found, tests would be run for each grade separately.

Correlation of LAS and Teacher Rating
of Oral Language Proficiency for LEP
and Comparison Students

Grade	Pre program	Post program
Total		
K		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		

INTERESTING, BUT NOT ESSENTIAL

EXHIBIT VII

FORMAT FOR REPORTING INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

Objective 5: Staff Development

Objective. Staff competencies and knowledge of bilingual educational methodologies, program management, testing and language training will be developed through a program of preservice and in-service staff training.

Intended Performance. A series of five activities will be implemented:

5.1 Summer in-service program sponsored by Title VII Bilingual Consortium for Advancement;

5.2 Career Ladder Program at the State University;

5.3 District-sponsored Title VII workshops;

5.4 Ongoing workshops provided by district support staff, Title VII Cross-cultural Resource Center, and independent consultants;

5.5 Classroom demonstration lessons for staff, provided by consultants and support staff.

These activities will be documented and described by program staff, with participants providing evaluative information on each training occasion.

Actual Performance. (A summary of the documentation and description information with additional overview information of how participants felt about the efficacy of the training.)

Program Issues. (A summary of critical concerns and events which were considered by either staff or participants to be problems of facilitating factors. Also discussed would be implications for changes for future staff development activities.)

POST-TEST

Part I:

Establishing an Evaluation Team

1. What are the major activities of an evaluation?

2. What are some of the ways in which parents, community, and students may participate in a Title VII program evaluation?

3. Name five important qualities that an evaluator should possess.

4. Name five possible sources of information about potential external evaluators.

5. What is a common pitfall in kicking off a program evaluation?

6. Describe two ways to establish initial agreements with a program evaluator.

7. What are some of the key elements to be included in the final agreements reached with the external evaluator?

Determining the Purposes and Objectives of the Evaluation

1. Name five possible purposes of program staff for conducting a program evaluation.

2. In what two categories can evaluation objectives be placed? Describe the difference between these two basic approaches to program evaluation.

Determining the Evaluation Questions, Variables, and Methodology

1. Describe the sequence of events following the establishment of the final roster of evaluation objectives which specify the elements of the evaluation design and process.

2. Name and discuss two important considerations in the selection of language proficiency measures for the evaluation.

3. What are some of the drawbacks of evaluation "burden" on staff and students?

4. Typically, what will be contained in an evaluation report?

Part II:

Gathering Evaluation Evidence

1. **What are some of the common concerns that may arise during the collection of evaluation evidence?**

Analysis of Evaluation Evidence

2. **How can program staff facilitate the preparation of evaluation evidence for analysis?**

Reporting the Evaluation

1. **What are the four basic types of reporting in an evaluation?**

Part III:

1. **What are the four basic things usually involved in using evaluation results?**

POST-TEST ANSWERS

Answers will be found on page 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Citations from Text

Bissell, J. S. Program impact evaluations: an introduction for managers of Title VII projects. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1980.

California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research. Statewide summary of pupil performance on school district proficiency assessments. Sacramento, CA: March, 1981.

Marliave, R., Fisher, C., Filby, N., Dishaw, M. Observation manual of the beginning teacher evaluation study. San Francisco, CA: Far West Educational Laboratory, 1980.

Merino, B., and Spencer, M. The comparability of English and Spanish versions of oral language proficiency instruments. Paper presented to the Association of Mexican American Educators, State of California, San Diego, CA, November 14, 1980.

Simon, A., and Boyer, E.G. (Eds.). Mirrors for behavior: an anthology of observation instruments. Research for Better Schools, Inc., a Regional Educational Laboratory, 1965.

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Reading and mathematics observation system, RAMOS/SEDL. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1978.

Reviews of Language Assessment Instruments

Bye, T. J. Tests that measure language ability: a descriptive compilation. Berkeley, CA.: Bay Area Bilingual Education League, 1978.

California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research. Language proficiency instrument review by the language proficiency instrument review committee. Sacramento, CA.: 1980; 1981.

Gillmore, G., and Dickerson, A. The relationship between instruments used for identifying children of limited English speaking ability in Texas. Houston, Texas: Region IV Education Service Center, 1750 Seamist, 77008, November, 1979.

Silverman, R. J., Noa, J. K., Russell, R. H., and Molina, J. C. Oral language tests for bilingual students, an evaluation of language dominance and proficiency instruments. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Center for Bilingual Education, 1976.

Spencer, M. L. Selective review of Spanish/English tests of achievement and oral language development. Sacramento, CA.: California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research, July, 1978.

Ulibarri, D. M., Spencer, M. L., and Rivas, G. A. Language proficiency and academic achievement: a study of language proficiency tests and their relationship to school ratings as predictors of academic achievement. Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education, 1981, V, 3, 47-80.

Questionnaire and Interview Methods

Weisberg, H. F., and Bowen, B. D. An introduction to survey research and data analysis. San Francisco, CA.: W. H. Freeman and Co., 1977.

Program Evaluation

Popham, W. J. Evaluation in education, current applications. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, 1974.

Posavac, E. J., and Carey, R. G. Program evaluation: methods and case studies. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1980.

Thorndike, R. L., and Hagen, E. P. Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1977.

Wolf, R. M. Evaluation in education, foundations of competency assessment and program review. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Qualitative Evaluation Techniques

Rudes, B. A., Goldsamt, M. R., and Cervenka, E. J. Planning paper 6: issues in applying ethnography to bilingual classroom settings. Arlington, VA.: Development Associates for NIE, July 2, 1980.

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1982 -574-268